



## City of Huntington Beach Planning Department

# STAFF REPORT

**TO:** Planning Commission  
**FROM:** Howard Zelefsky, Director of Planning  
**BY:** Rosemary Medel, Associate Planner  
**DATE:** March 9, 2004

**SUBJECT: ZONING TEXT AMENDMENT NO. 03-02 (ENTITLEMENT PERMIT  
STREAMLINING PHASE II)**

---

### **STATEMENT OF ISSUE:**

- ♦ Zoning Text Amendment No. 03-02 request:
  - Amendment of 15 chapters of the Zoning and Subdivision Ordinance and Downtown Specific Plan SP 5
  - Entitlement permit streamlining of certain applications to the lower hearing body
  - Codify existing policies
  - Clarify certain sections of the Zoning and Subdivision Ordinance
- ♦ Staff's Recommendation:  
Approve Zoning Text Amendment No. 03-02 based upon the following:
  - Decreases processing time for applicants
  - Reduces application costs for the business community and residents
  - Provides improved customer service
  - Encourages new businesses to locate in Huntington Beach
  - Continues to provide for quality development

### **RECOMMENDATION:**

Motion to: "Approve Zoning Text Amendment No. 03-02 with findings (Attachment No. 1) and forward to City Council for adoption."

### **ALTERNATIVE ACTION(S):**

The Planning Commission may take alternative actions such as:

- A. "Deny Zoning Text Amendment No. 03-02 with findings and forward to City Council."
- B. "Continue Zoning Text Amendment No. 03-02 and direct staff accordingly."

## **PROJECT PROPOSAL:**

Zoning Text Amendment No. 03-02 is a request by the City of Huntington Beach to amend 15 chapters of the Huntington Beach Zoning and Subdivision Ordinance (ZSO) and Downtown Specific Plan SP 5 as listed below. The legislative draft is provided in Attachment No. 3; Attachment No. 4 lists the page numbers of the legislative draft where changes are proposed for easy reference.

- Chapter 203 Definitions
- Chapter 204 Use Classifications
- Chapter 210 Residential Districts
- Chapter 211 Commercial Districts
- Chapter 212 Industrial Districts
- Chapter 214 Public-Semipublic Districts
- Chapter 220 Oil Production Overlay District
- Chapter 222 FP Floodplain Overlay District.
- Chapter 230 Site Standards
- Chapter 231 Off-Street Parking
- Chapter 233 Signs
- Chapter 236 Nonconforming Uses and Structures
- Chapter 241 Conditional Use Permits and Variances; Temporary Use Permits; Waiver of Development Standards
- Chapter 244 Design Review
- Chapter 250 General Provisions
- Specific Plan No. 5 Downtown Specific Plan

The purpose of the request is to streamline the entitlement process, decrease processing time, create cost-savings for applicants, and most importantly improve customer service by allowing the review of a project by the lower hearing body. The Zoning Administrator would review certain applications currently heard by the Planning Commission and the Director of Planning would be given more discretionary authority to approve minor zoning applications. The items selected for streamlining are those that typically are approved without controversy, would not necessitate the preparation of a Planning Commission staff report, i.e., could adequately be handled at the Zoning Administrator or Director level. The Zoning Text Amendment codifies some existing policies and direction from the Planning Commission in addition to clarifying certain sections of the code.

## **Background**

Entitlement Permit Streamlining Phase I was approved by City Council on December 17, 2001 and became effective on February 7, 2002. Phase I amended approximately 20 code sections affecting 12 chapters and incorporated existing policies, as well as minor clean-up items. The amendments also included revisions to the Downtown Specific Plan SP 5, Districts 2, 4 and 6.

At the August 12, 2003, City Council meeting, the City Council discussed the issue of implementing code amendments as Phase II of the Entitlement Permit Streamlining process. Council stated “that in times of budget reductions, staff cutbacks, and tough economic times it seems appropriate to re-visit the streamlining of the entitlement process of the City’s Zoning and Subdivision Ordinance.” Council further stated that streamlining the ZSO serves to benefit both the City as well as the private sector.

## **ISSUES:**

### **General Plan Conformance:**

The proposed project is consistent with the goals and policies of the City's General Plan as follows:

#### **A. Land Use Element**

Goal LU 7: Achieve a diversity of land uses that sustain the City's economic viability, while maintaining the City's environmental resources and scale and character.

The proposed amendments, by decreasing permit processing time, will encourage new businesses to establish in Huntington Beach adding to the depth and diversity of the city's business stock.

#### **B. Housing Element**

Policy HE 4.1.3: Review all regulations, ordinances, departmental processing procedures, and residential fees related to rehabilitation and/or construction to assess their impact on housing costs, and revise as appropriate.

The proposed text amendments fulfill this policy by streamlining the review process for multi-family development by increasing the amount of units allowed to be heard by the Planning Director and the Zoning Administrator thereby reducing application costs and processing time.

#### **C. Economic Development Element**

Policy ED 2.4.1: Encourage and assist existing and potential commercial owners to modernize and expand their commercial properties.

The proposed streamlining would increase the size of permitted personal enrichment lease spaces to 5,000 square feet, assuming certain criteria are met, thereby reducing processing time and application fees and encouraging businesses to expand to or locate in larger lease spaces within the city.

### **Zoning Compliance:**

The zoning text amendment changes existing standards within the code to improve permit processing.

### **Urban Design Guidelines Conformance:**

Not applicable.

### **Environmental Status:**

The proposed project is categorically exempt pursuant to City Council Resolution No. 4501, Class 20, which supplements the California Environmental Quality Act.

**Coastal Status:**

This project would be considered a minor amendment to the City's Local Coastal Program and will be forwarded to the California Coastal Commission with other minor amendments.

**Redevelopment Status:** Not applicable.

**Design Review Board:** Not applicable.

**Subdivision Committee:** Not applicable.

**Public Notification:**

Legal notice was published in the Huntington Beach/Fountain Valley Independent on February 26, 2004, and notices were mailed out to individuals/organizations requesting notification (Planning Department's Notification Matrix) as well as all interested parties. A pending public hearing notification is posted on the City's website under "Major Projects" informing the public of the Entitlement Permit Streamlining Phase II and the availability of the legislative draft for review at the City's Planning Counter and at Central Library. As of March 4, 2004, no communication supporting or opposing the request has been received in response to the hearing notice.

**ANALYSIS:**

The following analysis provides a review of the proposed amendments in five sections. Sections A-C analyze those ZSO applications that will be reviewed by the Zoning Administrator, the Planning Director and amendments affecting the Design Review Board. At the February 24<sup>th</sup> study session, the Planning Commission requested further discussion on certain amendments. These discussions will be found at the various sections of this analysis based on which hearing body is impacted. Section D provides a discussion regarding the codification of existing policies. The amendments to the Downtown Specific Plan SP 5 are reviewed in Section E.

***A. Planning Commission Items Proposed for Zoning Administrator Consideration***

The following items currently require a conditional use permit (CUP) before the Planning Commission (PC). The code amendment would still require a CUP, however, it would now be subject to review and approval by the Zoning Administrator (ZA).

***Chapter 210 Residential Districts***

- 11-20 Residential Units (Attachment No 3.31)

***Chapter 211 Commercial Districts***

- Group Residential-Boarding Houses (Attachment No. 3.52)
- Residential Care, General-24 hr care w/no medical (Attachment No. 3.52)
- Convalescent Facilities-Allows Medical Care (Attachment No. 3.52)
- Commercial Recreation and Entertainment-Health Clubs, Bowling Alleys (Attachment No. 3.53)
- Eating and Drinking Establishments with Dancing (Excludes Downtown Specific Plan SP 5) (Attachment No. 3.53)

- Vehicle Equipment Sales & Services-Auto Washing, Commercial Parking, Service Stations (Attachment No. 3.54)
- Visitor Accommodations-Hotels, Motels in the Commercial General Zone only, Bed & Breakfast Inns all Commercial Zones (Attachment No.3.54)

*Chapter 212 Industrial Districts*

- Minor Utilities (Attachment No. 3.64)
- Commercial Recreation and Entertainment (Attachment No. 3.64)
- Communication Facilities (Attachment No. 3.64)
- Quasi-Residential (Attachment No. 3.64)
- Service Stations (Attachment No. 3.65)
- Schools, Public or Private (Attachment No. 3.64)
- Warehouse and Sales Outlets (Attachment No. 3.65)

*Chapter 222 FP Floodplain Overlay District*

- Minor Utilities (Attachment No. 3.92)

*Chapter 231 Off Street Parking and Loading Provisions*

- Reduced Parking for Certain Uses (Attachment No. 3.166)
- Parking Controls-Valet Service, or booths (Attachment No.3.173)

*Chapter 233 Signs*

- Electronic Readerboards (Attachment No. 3.190)

These items are recommended for reduced processing for two primary reasons. First, issues related to these uses are typically straightforward and could be adequately handled at the ZA level. Staff believes that because these items would still be subject to a public hearing, any potential neighborhood concerns would be addressed with full consideration. Second, improving processing time, as well as savings in applications costs, will continue to assist businesses reduce their start-up business costs.

Effective November 3, 2003, the City's processing fees were increased to recover processing costs. For example, a conditional use permit to the PC, with a processing time of a minimum of six months, was increased from \$3,858 to \$6,815. A conditional use permit by the ZA, with a processing time of a minimum of three months, was increased from \$1,170 to \$3,502. Reducing the processing costs of non-controversial applications would provide significant financial relief for citizens and the business community as well as cut processing time in half.

### Planning Commission Issues

After review and discussion of the proposed amendments to the ZSO at the February 24, 2004 Planning Commission study session, the Planning Commission requested further discussion on the following code amendment sections.

#### 11-20 Residential Units (Section 210.04)

Pursuant to the ZSO, the ZA can currently consider approval of projects with five to nine residential units. The proposed amendment increases this number to a range of 11 to 20 units. The reason for this proposed amendment is to reduce processing time and associated application costs for a conditional use permit, which is \$8,396 from the PC, and \$3,502 if heard by the ZA. The approval process would still require review of compliance with development standards for items such as design, setbacks, height, open space

and parking. Given the small scale of these projects and recent experience with similar size projects it would be reasonable to conclude that the potential for controversial projects is not likely.

Staff surveyed cities in Southern California, with the majority in Orange County, to compare the number of units permitted at the Director level, or lower hearing body level, as compared to the Planning Commission. Staff gathered the following data:

*Southern California Land Use Controls for Multi-Family Units*

	City	Number of Units	Land Use Control
1.	Brea	1-3 4 or more	Permitted with certain limitations PC
2.	Buena Park	No # Restriction	Site Plan Review Process
3.	Costa Mesa	No # Restriction	Permitted with exception to R1
4.	Cypress (No Planning Commission)	1-3  4 or more	Approved at staff level-consent calendar to City Council CUP to City Council
5.	Fullerton	No # Restriction	Permitted with no zone change
6.	Garden Grove	No # Restriction	Site Plan Review only
7.	Los Alamitos	No # Restriction of single family or apartment  Condos-any number	Site Plan Review only  PC
8.	Newport Beach	No # Restriction	P-unless waiver is required. Waivers require PC approval
9.	Torrance	No # Restriction on Apts  All Condos	P- PC required in C1 and C2 zones  PC
10.	Westminster	1-2 3-4 5 or more	Staff Review PC non-public hearing review PC public hearing review

P-Permitted

PC- Planning Commission Conditional Use Permit (CUP)

These data indicate that three cities require PC review for projects with four or more units while seven allow review at staff level regardless of the number of units (two cities do require PC review for condominiums). Ultimately, the objective is to consider if the policies adopted by a city meet the goals and objectives of the General Plan. Staff believes that the proposed amendments to increase the unit consideration at the ZA level and the Director level would meet the goals and objectives of the General Plan and would not adversely impact the quality of design or the depth of project analysis conducted.

*Reduced Parking for Certain Uses (Section 231.08)*

The proposed amendment would not eliminate the required findings for approval of a request to reduce the number of parking spaces based on the type of business proposed for a site. However, reducing the

level of review from PC to ZA would expedite the processing time for a business desiring to locate in Huntington Beach. Similar to what the PC does now, the ZA would consider survey data from a traffic engineer to support an applicant's request for a reduction from the parking standards of the ZSO.

*Parking Controls-Valet Service, or Booths (Section 231.18)*

In the past 10 years, a total of four applications have been processed under the criteria of this section. All four applications were for security gates. The last application was processed in 1999, prior to the Entitlement Permit Streamlining Phase I. Phase I added criteria to this section, which if met, would eliminate the requirement for a CUP. To date, no new CUPs have been processed for a use regulated by this section of the code. Reducing the CUP requirement from PC to ZA would still permit noticing of a public hearing at the same radius required at the PC level. Uses listed within the section such as valet service/booths, or collection of fees would typically be requests for existing businesses and the City would be aware of any code violations or operational problems with these businesses. Review at the ZA level, as with the PC level, would consider existing factors of operation, compliance with development standards and the impact of the proposed additional service.

*Electronic Readerboards (Section 233.14)*

The most recent approval of an electronic readerboard was in 2003, which was approved with no controversy. Historically, the City's experience with processing these signs has not been controversial and issues of location, design, illumination and message copy are all regulated in the ZSO. The readerboard signs that have been approved by the City have all complied with these standards. Therefore, staff believes that reducing this process to the lower hearing body would not adversely impact the City.

***B. Zoning Administrator Items Proposed for Director Consideration***

The following list of items currently require approval of a CUP by the ZA. The Planning Director would now act on these items. Certain uses require a Neighborhood Notification (NN) process and an appeal period prior to approval or the issuance of building permits. With NN, property owners and tenants are provided an opportunity to review and comment on the proposal, as described below. Those uses that do not require NN can be approved by the Planning Department with no further review other than plan check.

*Chapter 210 Residential Districts*

- 2-10 Residential Units (Attachment No. 3.31)
- Day Care, Large-Family-No medical care permitted all R-Districts. (Attachment No. 3.31)
- Day Care, General- 24hr medical care in multiple family zones only. (Attachment No. 3.31)

*Chapter 211 Commercial Districts*

- Clubs and Lodges (Attachment No. 3.52)
- Eating and Drinking Establishments with Drive-Through (Attachment No. 3.53)
- Personal Enrichment in spaces equal to or less than 5,000 sq. ft. (Attachment No. 3.53)

*Chapter 220 Oil Production Overlay District*

- Reuse Plan Required (Attachment No. 3.84)

*Chapter 230 Site Standards*

- Accessory Dwelling Units will require Infill Notification (Attachment No. 3.104)
- Home Occupation Permits will require Neighborhood Notification (Attachment No. 3.105)

- Deviations in Maximum Height of Walls in RL and RMH Districts: Requires Neighborhood Notification (Attachment No. 3.140)
- Game Centers (Attachment No. 3.121)

#### *Chapter 231 Off-Street Parking*

- Compact Parking (Attachment No. 3.175)
- Parking Area Plan Required-Re-striping of existing parking (Attachment No. 3.176)

#### *Chapter 233 Signs*

- Sign Code Exceptions under 20 percent (Attachment No. 3.178)

As a result of changing the review of the above listed applications from the ZA to the Planning Director, the processing time for these applications would be significantly reduced. In lieu of the standard three months for Zoning Administrator items, streamlined requests could be approved at the planning counter. Fees for these requests would also be greatly reduced. For example, an eating and drinking establishment with a drive-through, or a personal enrichment use over 5,000 square feet, currently requires a CUP at a fee of \$3,502. Under the proposed zoning text amendment, this would no longer be required. Neighborhood Notification would only be required for those personal enrichment lease spaces over 5,000 square feet at a cost of \$736. In general, these items do not generate concerns or complaints at ZA hearings; therefore, staff does not believe that hearings are necessary for these types of uses. However, the Planning Director would be able to refer an item to the ZA if there were concerns regarding a particular request.

#### Additions to List of Uses Requiring Neighborhood Notification

The introduction of the “Limited Notification” process by the PC during Phase I of the Entitlement Permit Streamlining has served to provide citizens and business owners with an opportunity to review and comment on non-discretionary projects. This process, which will be renamed to Neighborhood Notification, has also reduced the burden of higher processing fees. The uses that presently require this notification will continue to be subject to this procedure.

Phase II Streamlining adds “Deviations in Maximum Height of Walls in RL and RMH Districts,” and “Home Occupation Permits” in all R-Districts to the Neighborhood Notification list. The initial legislative draft included the Neighborhood Notification procedures within Chapter 203, after further review staff determined that the appropriate location for such a procedure was in Chapter 241, “Conditional Use Permits and Variances; Temporary Use Permits; Waiver of Development Standards.” Thus the Neighborhood Notification process is now in Section 241.23. This section also leads the reader to Chapter 248 Notices, Hearings, Findings, Decisions, and Appeals. As stated in Chapter 248, an appeal of a Director’s decision can be appealed to the PC. To date, no Neighborhood Notification has been appealed.

#### Planning Commission Issues



Following is the list of amendments for which the Planning Commission requested further discussion. Staff does not believe that approval of these items without public hearings would result in any negative or unintended consequences for residents.

2-10 Residential Units (Section 210.04)

See the above discussion under 11-20 Units.

Accessory Dwelling Units (Section 230.10)

On July 1, 2003, AB 1866 became effective stating that cities can no longer require a discretionary permit for the development of accessory dwelling units in the State of California. While the law eliminated the public hearing process, it does permit cities to adopt development standards for these units. The legislative draft deletes the CUP requirement, while slightly modifying the current adopted development standards. The addition of compliance with the “Neighborhood Notification” process will give neighbors an opportunity to review a proposed accessory unit and the Infill Notification referenced in this section will ensure that design standards of privacy are met by these additions. Since the early 1990s a total of 10 accessory units have been approved in the city. A sudden proliferation of these units is not anticipated due to the stringent development standards required for these units, which require a minimum lot size of 6,000 square feet, limit the size of the accessory unit to a maximum of 650 square feet and require that the units be attached to the main dwelling.

Infill Ordinance (Section 230.22)

The Commission requested that a definition be included within the ZSO to clarify this process. Staff has inserted the definition of “Infill Lot Developments” as line item A, in Section 230.22 Residential Infill Lot Developments, which shall read as follows: (Attachment No. 3.112)

A. Definition.

1. An infill lot is contiguous to one or more existing single family residential units, excluding parcels separated by streets, and is either a vacant parcel intended for single family development, or a parcel with an existing residential structure, which will have 50 percent or more of the habitable area removed in order to remodel or construct a detached single family unit.

Deviation in Height of Fences/Walls (Section 230.88)

Since 1994, a total of 70 applications have been processed requesting relief from the fence/wall height requirements of the ZSO. As part of Phase I, the Planning Commission approved the increase of wall heights for those properties abutting arterials along the rear and/or street side of a property. This change was generated from comments from the Planning Commission regarding aesthetics along arterial streets where property owners had added fence extensions, usually of a different material and without permits.

The Phase II proposal allows property owners to encroach into the front yard setback by five feet (10 ft. setback) in the RL District and five feet (seven ft. setback) in the RMH-A District. The proposed criteria for fence and wall heights reflect the typical conditions placed on previous conditional use permit approvals by the ZA. The restrictions and conditions of location, design and materials ensure that a wall is compatible with the local neighborhood including providing sufficient landscaping in the front setback area. Although the evaluation of design is often subjective, the Planning Department uses the adopted Urban Design Guidelines as the basis for good design and selection of materials. Also taken into

consideration is the existing design and materials of adjacent properties. The proposed amendment further requires that the Neighborhood Notification process be implemented. Property owners and tenants adjacent to or across the street from the subject property will be notified of the proposed wall and provided with a 10 day period to review the proposed plans. Upon the end of the initial review period, the 10 day appeal period will commence. An appeal of the Director's approval is submitted to the Planning Commission.

This amendment provides a substantial cost reduction to property owners who pay the current fee of \$1,937 for a CUP to the ZA. The Neighborhood Notification cost is \$736. The amendment would also reduce the processing time from three months to a maximum of 20 days.

#### Games Centers (Section 230.38)

Game Centers are listed in Chapter 204 of the ZSO under the designation of "Commercial Recreation and Entertainment," and regulated under the criteria in Chapter 230.38 Game Centers. Within the past several years, staff has seen an increase in a type of these centers, typically known as cyber cafés or internet cafes, both of which offer Internet Access. This amendment proposes to delete the CUP process and retain the existing requirements. Since 1994, four applications have been processed for game centers. These uses have not been controversial and have not been appealed to the Planning Commission. They are further monitored by the Police Department to ensure that those computers capable of accessing adult sites are clearly separated from minors. Given the extensive operational conditions and the monitoring by both the Police Department and Code Enforcement, staff believes a discretionary permit is not warranted.

#### ***C. Design Review Board Items Proposed for Director Consideration***

The following items currently require review by the Design Review Board (DRB) with a recommendation to the Planning Director and, as proposed, would require Planning Director action only.

##### *Chapter 233 Signs*

- Sign Code Exception-over 20 percent (Attachment No.3.179)
- Areas within 500 feet of PS (Public Semi-Public District-Language Deleted (Attachment No.3.180))

##### *Chapter 244 Design Review*

- Areas subject to specific plans-Only Downtown Specific Plan SP 5 will be subject to DRB (Attachment No. 3.216)

Phase I of the Entitlement Permit Streamlining reduced the level of review for sign code exceptions from ZA to DRB when the code exception exceeded 10 percent. For requests less than 10 percent the item is processed at the Director level. The proposed amendment would increase the threshold for DRB applications to 20 percent. The Planning Department has found that the current threshold places unnecessary costs and processing time on applicants. These applications are not controversial and have been approved without being appealed. For these reasons, this item should be deleted from this section of Chapter 233, "Signs".

Under Chapter 233, Signs, all sign requests within 500 feet of PS Zone require DRB approval. A stand-alone business requesting the installation of a new sign or existing commercial centers with less than five lease spaces would require DRB approval. This process places an unnecessary burden on the applicant.

Given the design suggestions of the Urban Design Guidelines and Chapter 233 sign criteria, staff believes this line item should be deleted as the quality of design will not be negatively impacted deleting the DRB review process.

Specific plans that do not explicitly require DRB will be reviewed at the Director level. Conversely, the Downtown Specific Plan SP 5 will remain under the review of the DRB as that level of review is specifically identified in the document. By proposing this amendment, the processing time for projects located in most specific plan areas would be cut in half: from one to two months to one to four weeks. The current DRB fee of \$879 would no longer be required. DRB items are typically not noticed meetings. However, uses within specific plans that require Neighborhood Notification under the ZSO, would be noticed. Under NN, the public would have an opportunity to review businesses such as personal enrichment uses, sign code exceptions under 20 percent, etc. The City's adopted Urban Design Guidelines provide staff with an additional tool to achieve the City's goals for design of homes, additions to existing homes and approval of signs within specific plan areas as well as other areas. The Planning Director would have the option of referring items to the DRB as needed.

#### ***D. Codify Existing Policy***

Existing policy memos for the following items would be codified with the Zoning Text Amendment. Streamlining is also proposed for many of these items, which is further discussed in Sections A&C.

- New Canopies for Existing Service Stations (Attachment No. 3.116), 1994
- Parking Standards for Health Clubs (Attachment No. 3.162), 1995
- Re-stripping of Existing Nonconforming Parking Areas (Attachment No. 3.176), 1996
- Personal Enrichment Parking (Attachment No. 3.163), 1996
- Patio and Balcony Enclosures Proposed within existing Planned Developments or Apartment Complexes. (Attachment No. 3.42), 1997
- Single-Family Residential Development in the Downtown Specific Plan (Dist. No. 2,4&6) 1997 (Attachment No. 3.256)
- Minor Accessory Structures in Residential Districts (Attachment No. 3.103) 2001
- Swimming Pools, Slides and Rock Formations in Residential Districts. (Attachment No. 3.103) 2001
- Accessory Dwelling Unit (Attachment No. 3.104) 2003

The City's policy memos for the first five items have been in effect since 1997, with the most recent policy implemented in July 2003. By codifying these policies in the ZSO, processing information is accessible by applicants on the City's website. This will help to further the City's goal of assisting the applicant in project planning and improving customer service.

#### ***E. Downtown Specific Plan SP 5***

Phase I of the Permit Streamlining Ordinance amended sections of District 2, 4, & 6 "Single Family Residential Development," to allow approval of single family homes through the plan check process and, in most cases, require notification under the Infill Ordinance. The Phase II amendments separate and clarify the various levels of review for all districts. The Downtown Specific Plan, while unique in

character and design standards, would correspond to the hearing body review of the ZSO. In addition, an existing policy memo that governs development standards for single family homes would be codified.

### ***Appeal Procedures***

Unless otherwise stated, action on any item may be appealed pursuant to Chapter 248 of the ZSO. Decisions of the Planning Director, Zoning Administrator and Design Review Board may be appealed to the Planning Commission. Planning Commission decisions may be appealed to the City Council. The City's Notice of Action letters include information on how a decision may be appealed. In addition, a handout explaining the appeal process is available at the Planning Counter. Zoning Text Amendment No. 03-02 does not propose any change to the City's appeal procedures.

### **SUMMARY:**

Zoning Text Amendment No. 03-02 modifies the Huntington Beach Zoning and Subdivision Ordinance, including sections of the Downtown Specific Plan, for the purpose of improving customer service by streamlining the entitlement process. The recommended text amendments are those that provide relief to the business community and residents while ensuring that issues of neighborhood compatibility, aesthetics, etc. still receive adequate consideration.

Staff recommends that Zoning Text Amendment No. 03-02 be approved for the following reasons:

- Decreases processing time for applicants
- Reduces application costs for the business community and residents
- Provides improved customer service
- Encourages new businesses to locate in Huntington Beach
- Continues to provide for quality development

### **ATTACHMENTS:**

1. Suggested Findings of Approval
2. Draft Ordinance
3. Legislative Draft
4. Legislative Draft Page Number Reference

## **ATTACHMENT NO. 1**

### **SUGGESTED FINDINGS**

#### **ZONING TEXT AMENDMENT NO. 03-02**

#### **SUGGESTED FINDINGS FOR APPROVAL – ZONING TEXT AMENDMENT NO. 03-02:**

1. Zoning Text Amendment No. 03-02 to amend certain sections of the Zoning and Subdivision Ordinance and the Downtown Specific Plan and is consistent with the objectives, policies, general land uses and programs specified in the General Plan and any applicable specific plan because the amendments streamline entitlement processing for certain uses thereby furthering the City's development goals.
3. In the case of a general land use provision, the zoning text amendment is compatible with the uses authorized in, and the standards prescribed for, the zoning district for which it is proposed. The amendment revises processing of entitlements and clarifies permitted uses within the zoning classifications.
4. A business community need is demonstrated for the change. The need for reduced processing time is desired by the business community and supported by the Chamber of Commerce.
5. Its adoption will be in conformity with public convenience, general welfare and good zoning practice by codifying existing policies and creating a zoning and subdivision ordinance more reflective of City priorities.